



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/593,919	09/22/2006	Takato Kobayashi	07200/083001	5893
22511	7590	11/13/2007	EXAMINER	
OSHA LIANG L.L.P. 1221 MCKINNEY STREET SUITE 2800 HOUSTON, TX 77010			LUEBKE, RENEE S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2833	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/13/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@oshaliang.com
buta@oshaliang.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/593,919	KOBAYASHI & NOZAKI & WATANABE
	Examiner Renee S. Luebke	Art Unit 2833

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 22 September 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/22/06</u> | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

1. The drawings are objected to because the cross-hatching is incorrect. Insulative materials should be shown appropriately. In addition, Fig. 7 should be labeled -Prior Art- or something similar. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application.

Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

2. It is noted that there are two Abstracts present in the file. Neither meet the requirement of a proper Abstract. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

3. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

4. Claims 3 and 5 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- Claim 3 lacks antecedent basis for "the key top made of hard resin" on the last line.
- Claim 5 lacks antecedent basis for "said through holes" on line 2, and "each other" and "the back side" on line 3.

Appropriate corrections are required.

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Taylor. This cover member for a push-button switch comprises a hard base 25 and a keypad 10, wherein the hard base is made of a hard resin (column 4, lines 53-54) with a through hole for a key top, and wherein the keypad is made of a silicone rubber film (column 4, lines 55-56). A front surface (at 23) of the keypad is in contact with an entire back surface of the hard base; the step formed at interface 23 is seen to be “an entire back surface” as claimed. The keypad is exposed through the through hole, and a back surface of the keypad corresponding to the through hole is provided with a press projection (bottom of plunger 18) for pressing a contact point 11.

8. Claims 3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor in view of Schmidt, et al. Taylor lacks a keytop made of a hard resin. However, Schmidt teaches (for a similar switch) that it is advantageous to add a hard button top 40, as it improves durability (column 4, line 47). For the same reason, it would have been obvious to top the key of Taylor with a hard resin cap. In addition, Schmidt teaches using a transparent

base (column 4, lines 49-51) for light transmission. As keys and keyboards often require lighting, it would have been obvious to use a transparent resin on the device of Taylor as taught by Schmidt.

9. Claim 5, as best understood, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor in view of Larson. Larson teaches the use of a plurality of switches similar to that of Taylor. Switches such as these are often found in groups because they are used to operate a plurality of functions on the same device. Larson is one example of this, and further teaches grooves 160, behind the hard base and between the individual switches, in order to equalize pressure. For the same reasons, it would have been obvious to use a plurality of switches, of the type taught by Taylor, and including the features of Larson.

10. Claims 4, 7 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor in view of Fujiki, et al. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor and Schmidt, as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Fujiki. Fujiki teaches the manufacture of an electrical component formed of a polycarbonate resin and a selectively adhesive silicone rubber in the manner and with the same materials claimed. It would have been obvious to form the base and keypad of Taylor in this manner in order to achieve the good bonds and ease of assembly taught by Fujiki. In regard to claim 8, Schmidt teaches assembling the keytop after assembly of the base and keypad; this step would still be appropriate using the materials and method taught by Fujiki.

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The prior art (fig. 2) of Iida shows a device similar to

that of the present application. Calder and Nakao show similar keyboards with silicone rubber buttons (Calder) or a polycarbonate resin base (Nakao).

12. Any response to this action may be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to:
(571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to Mrs. Renee Luebke whose telephone number is (571) 272-2009.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mrs. Paula Bradley, can be reached at (571) 272-2800, extension 33.



Renee S. Luebke
Primary Patent Examiner
November 6, 2007